

## The Sun

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1898.

Subscriptions by Mail, Post-Paid.

DAILY, per Month	60
DAILY, per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, per Year	1 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	7 00
WEEKLY, per Year	2 00

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PAID—Kingside No. 15, near Grand Hotel, and Kingside No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

## Third Stage of National Evolution.

In contemplating the probable results of the war, in the way of enlarged national responsibilities and more intimate connection with affairs outside of present boundaries, but esteemed contemporary, the *Harford* Copyright, remarks:

"This is not the future which President Gomez was once foretold, and which, for the United States, it will mean, necessarily, if it comes, a notable enlargement of our military and naval establishments. It will require a modification of our political institutions, the idea of the Philippines as a State of the Union, it will also require a radical transformation of our habits of thought, and will expose us to anxieties to which we have hitherto been strangers. Imperial responsibilities and worries go with imperial power, and the United States, with its new experience for the republic which for more than a century has held steadily aloof from the rivalries and contentions of old-world politics, but it is not an experience to be welcomed with unalloyed rejoicing."

Do not be dismayed at the prospect which this sunrise in the Far East reveals.

Once before, in the character of the Union and the spirit of our institutions have been transformed by the magic of mighty events.

Neither GEORGE WASHINGTON nor any of the founders of the republic foresaw the great change which the civil war of thirty-seven years ago was to work in the fabric of their heroism and statesmanship.

Yet the republic survived the transformation, more closely knit, more homogeneous, more truly national than before; and the same old Constitution, God bless it! with such amendment as destiny and progress made necessary, is still in force.

The period between 1861 and 1898 was the second period of American development and growth.

We are now at the beginning of the third stage.

## Possible Work for Our Ships.

Admiral Dewey's assertion that he holds Manila under his guns, and can reduce it whenever he chooses, has properly stimulated the imagination of the people.

Practically the taking of Manila will carry with it the control of the whole group of islands; yet so vast is their extent that the Spaniards might make a show of resistance elsewhere even after losing Manila.

There are, in fact, other points in the islands garisoned by Spain, notable among them being Iloilo, in Panay. But all these places can be reduced by even a small part of the fleet, and their troops, if wise, would surrender without a fight.

Spain's loss of the Antilles and the Philippines ought to bring forthwith an end of the war, but should she make a pretense of continuing it she would have still more to lose.

In the Pacific she has the Caroline Islands, a widely scattered archipelago, where we used to have a missionary station at Ponape until a few years ago, when Spain was forced to withdraw from the missionaries that one of our warships took them away. Associated with them are the Pelew Islands. More important are the Ladrone, or Mariana Islands, which are very fertile, while on Guam the principal island is the town of San Ignacio de Agaña, which is worthy of our consideration as a naval station. These islands, north of the Carolines and on the route from Honolulu to the Philippines, might become important to us.

It is clear, at all events, that Admiral Dewey will find work to do in the Pacific, even if Spain should not accept the occupation of Manila and Havana as the end of the war. In the Atlantic we should find a point of interest in the Canaries. Fernando Po, further south, is a beautiful island, occupied as a penal settlement, which would probably not make us any the less a rather significant, however, that the Spaniards are busily defending Port Mahon, in the Balearic Islands, as if she feared that even the Mediterranean might not escape the attention of our fleets.

## Capt. Mahan as a Prophet.

Between the lines of Capt. MAHAN'S famous books on the influence of sea power upon history may be formulated certain prophecies concerning the Spanish Navy, some of which have been verified already by the reports received from Admiral Dewey at Manila, while the fulfillment of others may be expected in future reports from Admiral SAMPSON.

Capt. MAHAN'S books do not consider the Spaniards and their navy separately, but as incidents to his main theme, yet in every chapter during the period covered by the volumes, from 1600 to 1815, in which the Spanish Navy took part, that navy proved unequal to its task and developed fatal weaknesses. Those weaknesses undoubtedly exist to this day.

In summing up the results of the maritime war of 1778, Capt. MAHAN writes:

"As for the personnel of the Spanish Navy (in 1790) there is no reason to believe it better than fifteen years later, when, speaking of Spain giving certain ships to France, said: 'I take it for granted that Spain, as a nation, would be the readiest way to lose them again.'"

That the Spaniards are brave, there can be no denial. Admiral Dewey's reports indicate that, even if history did not show it. But more is needed than that.

The proper application of bravery is necessary; and that the Spaniards seem never to have known how to obtain.

The news reports of the troubles in Spain tell us that complaints have been made in the Cortes of the unprepared condition of the country, and especially of the navy. Of a period rather more than one hundred years ago, Capt. MAHAN writes, in "Sea Power in the French Revolution":

"The mobilization of the [British] fleet, though energetic when once begun, was nevertheless tardy, and Great Britain had reason to be thankful that the year of civil commotion and executive impotence had so greatly deteriorated the enemy's navy."

For the same reasons, we in the United States have to be thankful.

In the details of seamanship the abilities of the Spanish a century ago were on a par with the personnel and equipment of that navy. Concerning the battle of Cape St.

Vincent, fought on Feb. 14, 1797, Capt. MAHAN says:

"At this moment there was a great contrast between the array prepared by the approaching combatants. The British, formed during the night in two columns of eight and seven ships respectively, effected the commendation of their exacting chief 'for their admirable close order.' The Spaniards, on the contrary, 'in confusion through the night effect of wind and their own loose habits of sailing, were broken into two bodies.'"

Of this battle off Cape St. Vincent, MAHAN writes what the future historian of our navy will write about Dewey's victory at Manila. He says:

"The victory essential to Great Britain was won; the worthlessness of the Spanish Navy was revealed; it could no longer be counted a factor in the political situation."

That historian will have to write simply "the United States" instead of "Great Britain." With the change of those words, the sentence applies now precisely as it applied in 1797.

While MAHAN'S unspoken prophecies are in our favor, one note of warning must not go unheeded; it applies to our operations in the Philippines and in Cuba.

"It is well, then, to give maintenance all the assistance they evidently require in material of war, to keep alive as a diversion every source of trouble, to secure wherever possible a fortified port, by which to maintain free entrance for supplies to the country of the insurgents, but not the least important consideration for their own countrymen, outweighing their dislike for the foreigner. It is not good policy to send a force that, from its own numbers, is incapable of successful independent action, relying upon the support of the native in a civil war."

That we can obtain comfort from Capt. MAHAN'S prophecies is reason why we should not neglect his warning.

## Let It Be So Far a Democratic War.

What cause has taken possession of the nominal leaders and managers of the Democratic party in Congress? Do they want to make themselves and their party odious to the American people not only next November, but for many Novembers?

Here they are, combining and conspiring with Populists and cranks of various descriptions to defeat the War Revenue bill unless they are allowed to shape it to suit their general and particular theories of finance and of currency.

Yet it is only a week since a Democrat in the House, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK of Missouri, was boasting, in a somewhat crude and boisterous way, that the Democrats in Congress had forced the Administration and the country into the war with Spain.

"My Republican friends," said the Hon. CHAMP CLARK on Tuesday of last week, "I took you by the scruff of the neck and dragged you into it, and that will be the verdict of history. We started the fire among the people, and they heeded you no hot that at last you had to go into it or out of business."

Supposing that this were true, and that the war with Spain were in fact a war of Democratic origin, what would then be the verdict of history upon the men who, having forced the United States Government into military and naval operations, proceeded to strangle the Government and defeat the national cause by withholding the money needed to carry on the war, while they discussed silver seigniorage and greenback issues and theories of taxation and finance in general?

Such men are Spain's most powerful ally.

Let the American war be a Democratic war as far as they are concerned. If that is necessary in order to inspire them to act and vote like Americans.

## Bombardments.

The question of the conduct of naval hostilities in the present war has always had two entirely different phases, one being what our navy will feel justified in doing, and the other what Spain would do to us if she got the chance.

It may be assumed, for example, that Spain would not hesitate to bombard open or unfortified towns on our seaboard if she thought they were worth the time and the ammunition. She would bombard the undefended city of Valparaiso in 1895, because the Chileans refused to salute her flag, in token of her wrath for the consideration of an insult.

Besides, the bombardment of the city of Valparaiso, although condemned by the Brussels Conference of 1874, has been advocated by some naval authorities. Such places are subject to being levied upon for contributions, just as inland towns are, and would therefore seem liable to bombardment unless the indemnity is paid; for, with any hesitation to occupy, bombard or burn when a ransom is refused, there might be an end to regulations, because every town might refuse, even when able to pay.

From threats of bombardment or actual bombardment for the collection of ransom, it is an easy step to bombardment for the sheer sake of doing general damage to the hostile nation. Some naval writers have openly advocated that policy, and we cannot doubt that Spain would adopt it without hesitation.

But while Spain might thus find sanction in actual practice for throwing shells into New Jersey seaboard villages from a cruiser or privateer running along the coast, our own conduct will undoubtedly be governed by the principle that unfortified towns ought not to be wantonly bombarded. The case is analogous to that of undefended towns in the interior of Cuba, which our troops would never enter under an artillery fire that knocked down houses and killed non-combatants, because there would be no use in such barbarity.

We cover the reputation of our navy in war, and, with plenty of margin for future wars, we shall take care not to give ground to the very reproaches of needless cruelty to non-combatants which we have made against Spain in Cuba.

Nevertheless, those writers who hold that the bombardment of unfortified towns is in no case permissible are clearly wrong. If Spain, for example, finding herself wholly outclassed on the sea, and with no strength for attacking fortified ports like New York or Philadelphia, should yet believe that laying waste the coast between them would cause ships to be detached from the blockade of Cuba, could she not find in this enough to justify her? Besides, if leaving a port unfortified shows that it cannot lawfully be bombarded, what is the use of coast defenses costing millions? We might, if that is the real rule, have no coast forts, and then complacently argue that we were penniless in our defenselessness; or we could fortify Boston and Charleston, for example, and then tell our enemy, whether Spain or some far stronger power, to choose those points for bombardment, because no others could lawfully be attacked. The universal practice of nations refutes such a notion.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

power, to choose those points for bombardment, because no others could lawfully be attacked. The universal practice of nations refutes such a notion.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast. It is of no use to observe this point, because the question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast is a question of the propriety of the bombardment of the coast.

lards were, with some slight variations in the authorities: Reina Cristina, 3,520; Castilla, 3,342; Don Antonio de Ulloa, 3,152; Don Juan de Austria, 1,542; Isla de Luzon, 1,040; Isla de Cuba, 1,032; Velasco, 1,032; Isla de Leon, 824; El Cano, 824; Marquis del Duero, 800. In addition the Isla de Mindanao, 4,195 tons, was destroyed, but she was only an armed transport. Leaving her out, we have a total displacement of 19,846 against our 10,938. This does not look much like five to one.

We could not expect the *Saturday Review* to observe that the Spaniards had their shore forts to aid their ships, or that they were in a familiar harbor and our men in foreign waters. We could not expect it to see that splendid seamanship and splendid marksmanship were factors no less potent in the victory than displacement and armament. But why should it call the Spanish ships all wooden and mostly one-fifth as large as ours?

On the Eve of Manila.

In Madrid on April 26, four days before Dewey's victory, the subjoined bulletin was officially published by the Spanish Government and likewise circulated through Europe by a news agency. We find it in the *London Standard*:

"An American squadron, consisting of vessels of no great importance, is approaching Manila. There is great public enthusiasm in the Philippines, as in the United States, where the Spaniards are preparing to resist with great resolution."

This is worth preserving, not only as one of the curiosities of the war, but also as a further illustration of the almost pathetic ignorance and self-complacency prevailing at Madrid before Spain's sudden and terrible awakening.

Here you are, LARRY! Don't miss your golden opportunity! The covetous of Sing Sing have just heard of Dewey's victory. Now, shrug your shoulders and exclaim, "Naturally!" That's the way to do it, LARRY. You see we can give you a point, take an old man, and be happy. Everybody will read your editorial article; it will make him happier than yourself.

Referring to our recent remarks on the various versions of "The Star-Spangled Banner," a Baltimorean sends us a copy of the song as it appeared in the *Analytic Magazine* of Philadelphia in November, 1897. The song had already been published in several newspapers.

The lines of principal interest are thus printed: "White broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous flight."

"As it truly blows, half conceals half discloses."

"Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just."

Is there known any earlier printed version presenting this last line as it generally reads, and as it should read for patriotism?

"Then conquer we must, for our cause it is just."

If the cartel-throwing destroyer, Lieut. PANZA CARRANZA, really wants to fight a duel with some American, he should provide himself with a range-finder, and he should begin practicing with the side of a house. Spanish marksmanship is not a thing to be counted on.

The ventilation and the view of a statesman from Sardinia in the lower berth are not to be curtailed by the money power without cause if the Hon. WILLIAM AMBERG SULLIVAN can have his way. No uniformed tools of monopoly are to have the right to "make down" a bed over that sublime scence. The Money Devils shall not shake unoccupied blankets over the tribune of Tallahatche, Tate, and Tippah.

We venerate genius, yet may we dare to tell the Sage of Sardinia that his bill, as it is, scarcely reaches the upper berth? No doubt Congress has the same right and reason to prescribe how and when sleeping-car berths shall be made up that it has to prescribe, for instance, that the keeper of a hotel or lodging house in the Territories or the District of Columbia shall not open a folding-bed until somebody makes affidavit that he is ready to get into it; but there are coils and windings in this great question which even the luminous intellect of the Sage has not yet shed a satisfactory light.

To ordinary men, sprawling surly over a lower berth, not the empty but the occupied berth is the cause of anxiety. Will the rascal in it vex the dull ear of night with snoring? Is he fat and lumbering, and therefore sure to fill the imagination with pictures of the crushing ruin he would inflict if he should tumble through? Perhaps he is an earnest spirit, and will prattle to you about the crime of 1873. All sorts of